

1  
2  
3  
4 E-FILED on 6/3/09  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

LORI BELTRAN et al.,

No. C-03-03767 RMW

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA et al.,

ORDER REGARDING THE FILING UNDER  
SEAL OF THE ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT AND DENYING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO BIFURCATE TRIAL

Defendants.

Contemporaneously with the issuance of this order, the court has issued an order granting defendants' motion for summary judgment and denying plaintiffs' motion to bifurcate trial.

The court has filed the summary judgment order under seal out of a concern that the order may contain information from the parties' briefs and submissions that should be protected from public disclosure and not be made part of the publicly available record.

The parties are in the best position to initially identify what portions of the summary judgment order, if any, they believe should be redacted from the publicly filed version of the order. Accordingly, the parties are directed to identify for the court, within ten days of the date of this

ORDER REGARDING THE FILING UNDER SEAL OF THE ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO BIFURCATE TRIAL—No. C-03-03767 RMW  
AEA/TER

1 order, what portions of the summary judgment order they believe should be redacted from the  
2 publicly-filed version of the order, along with a brief justification for the claimed redactions. See  
3 Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu, 447 F.23d 1172, 1178-81 (9th Cir. 2005). After  
4 consideration of the parties' redaction requests, the court will prepare a redacted summary judgment  
5 order for public filing. Absent a meritorious request by a party that certain portions of the order be  
6 redacted from the publicly filed copy, the court will file the summary judgment order in the public  
7 file, unredacted.

8  
9 DATED: 6/3/09

  
RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

1 **Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:**

2 **Counsel for Plaintiffs:**

3 Robert Ross Powell rpowell@rrassociates.com

4 Dennis R. Ingols dingols@rrassociates.com

5 Douglas D. Durward Doug@durwardlaw.com

7 **Counsel for Defendants:**

8 Melissa R. Kiniyalocots melissa.kiniyalocots@cco.co.scl.ca.us

10 Gregory Joseph Sebastianelli gregory.sebastianelli@cco.co.scl.ca.us

11 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not  
registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

14 **Dated:** 6/3/09

TER  
**Chambers of Judge Whyte**